CHAPTER 6-SERVICE DISTRICTS

INTRODUCTION

The preceding chapters have provided background information on the physical character of the County and its demographics. This information helps to explain the foundation on which the goals and policies in the first chapter were formulated. These goals are the result of a merger between public policy and enlightened owner self-interest; that is, the realization by County government and residents alike of the need to retain the natural beauty of the County for public and private good while accommodating growth. In understanding this need, the County recognizes that its purpose is not to oppose change, but to provide for orderly, efficient, and well-planned growth while preserving and protecting the natural environment and countryside. Early speculative development can have a devastating effect upon the realization of the full potential of the area. The County seeks optimum development patterns and an equitable distribution of benefits, realizing in the process that the sum of subdivisions does not necessarily make a community. Chapters 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 translate the goals, policies, and background data into an action plan for the County.

LAND USE PLANS—GENERAL INFORMATION

In developing the following land use plans, and their supporting fiscal, transportation, and public facility/utility plans, it has been accepted as given that:

1. The County has a variety of physiographies each with attributes worth preserving, each with sensitivities to development, but each with areas suitable to some type of development; and that,

2. Areas suitable for development should be delineated and planned according to general County need, ability to provide services, and the character. of the area; and that,

3. Certain patterns of development may be a burden to the taxpayer and destructive to the environment and character of the County and, therefore, should be minimized.

For the purpose of developing land use plans the County is divided into three categories: service districts, villages and settlements (Chapters 6 and 7), and rural areas (Chapter 8). Areas designated as service districts are designed to accommodate the highest density residential, commercial, and industrial uses in the County. Service districts are either currently served with public utilities or planned for the future provision of some type of public utilities the form of public sewer or both. Village designations, of which there are three, have mixtures of residential, commercial, and service uses. Settlements are generally rural, residential clusters without any associated commercial or service areas.

The majority of the County, characterized by agricultural uses, open space, wooded tracts, and mountains,

is designated as rural area. It is divided for the purpose of zoning into the Rural Agricultural (RA) area and the Rural Conservation (RC) area. The RA land consists predominantly with open agricultural lands; the RC land contains predominantly the wooded mountain and steep slope areas.

SERVICE DISTRICTS

Introduction

A long-standing and important Fauquier County planning goal, re-adopted for the 1992-2010 plan, has been to concentrate and guide growth in and around Service Districts. Service Districts are the designated growth areas planned for the most intense development in terms of use and density. In order to support and promote growth, adequate public facilities and infrastructure, including public water and sewer, have been planned for the service districts.

However, portions of service districts may be designated to receive only one type of public utility where economic, physical or environmental considerations make the provision of all public services infeasible. Where this occurs, the portion of the service district which are not planned for public utilities are designated as "non-sewered" or "non-watered" growth areas as the case may be. While still part of the overall service district, these areas may be planned for substantially less growth and densities as the rest of the service district, but more than that found in the agricultural areas of the County.

The accomplishment of many other important County policies and goals is facilitated through the Service District concept, particularly protecting and promoting traditional agricultural uses, rural lifestyles, historic sites and areas, unique open spaces, and preserving the environment. By concentrating the majority of population growth and non-agricultural industrial and commercial uses in Service Districts, the County is able to promote other planning goals designed to protect the rural areas from unplanned and destructive growth and also provide public services in a more efficient and cost effective manner.

The County has nine designated Service Districts: Bealeton, Calverton, Catlett, Marshall, Midland, New Baltimore, Opal, Remington (which includes the Town of Remington) and Warrenton (which includes the Town of Warrenton). The incorporated town of The Plains functions as a Service District within its corporate boundaries. Warrenton, Bealeton, and Remington, are currently served by public water and sewer, and Opal is served by public sewer. Marshall is served by a public sewer and a private water system. New Baltimore and Catlett are served by public water but not sewer. Opal, Midland, and Calverton have no public services.

The Service District concept was introduced in the 1967 Comprehensive Plan. As originally conceived, these districts were designed to locate the most intense land uses near transportation and employment centers making use of existing development patterns. The districts were sized, and residential densities

were set, to accommodate an anticipated County population of 76,000 in 1980-85 and 235,000 by the year 2000. In order to absorb growth at the recommended densities, districts were planned with central sewer and water.

In 1977, after five years of review, a second Comprehensive Plan was adopted. This included a re-analysis of the anticipated population and adopted a shorter planning period of 10 rather than 20 years. The revised plan showed major decreases in the anticipated growth and corresponding reductions in the holding capacity of the Service Districts. The factors responsible for these changes were stated to be, *"the result of changes in the rates and patterns of urbanization, in transportation, in the economy, in legal precedent, and in other factors"* (including the Occoquan Policy). By reducing the Service District size to correspond with the revised population figures, and by designating future expansion areas, the County took a time phased approached to the Districts' development. This approach became viable with the new 10- year planning period and 5-year review. The methodology for establishing these revised Service Districts is described in Chapter 6 of the 1977 Plan. Since the basic districts have remained the same for the 1987 Plan and for this update, the reader is referred to the 1977 Plan for the details of how the districts were reconfigured.

Planning the Districts: 1992-2010

In planning the Service Districts, and in making periodic adjustments to Service District boundaries, land uses, and densities therein, the County reviews and analyzes a range of factors. Of the factors considered, existing land use and zoning, and the wishes of residents concerning Service District growth, are of major importance. To foster public participation, the Board of Supervisors in early 1992 appointed a committee of three citizens from each magisterial district to serve on an advisory committee to the Planning Commission. The Plan Review Advisory Committee (PRAC) met with citizens in their districts, and the

Planning Commission, on a frequent and continuing basis as the 1992-2010 plan was prepared. In addition, the Planning Commission held public meetings throughout the County to explain the planning process and to gather public information. Such meetings were held for all the Service Districts.

Service District Phasing

For this Plan, the planning period was decreased from 20 years to 18 years, or through 2010, to better plan for the projected population growth, to enable cost effective planning for public facilities, utilities, and transportation infrastructure, and to implement a time phased approach to Service District development. Consideration has been given to anticipated transportation, sewer, and water infrastructure needs. Implementation of the Service District plans in primarily dependent upon the provision of public water and sewer facilities to accommodate the planned densities for commercial, industrial, and residential uses. Providing the planned water and sewer infrastructure requires long range planning and capital

investments to produce timely and cost effective systems.

During the planning period, the Commission adopted the New Baltimore plan which recognized that some areas of the service districts were more appropriately served either only by water or only by sewer. First, a re-introduction of time phased development was instituted for each Service District. Second, public facilities and utilities have been planned to be brought online in response to demand and in a fashion that will minimize the front end costs of such improvements. Third, development in areas designated for future expansion of the Service District should be compatible with the Plan. As such, a fourth category consisting of those areas of service districts where it is feasible to provide water or sewer, but not both, needed to be identified and planned accordingly.

Service Districts: Phase 1, Phase 2, and Phase 3 Areas

For the 1992-2010 planning period the Service Districts have been planned to reflect future infrastructure planning. To assist with both the planning and the implementation program for the Service Districts, these areas have been planned for three phases of development, as set forth and defined below. The timeline established by these definitions directly reflects and incorporates the population forecast which is relied upon throughout this plan, as well as the anticipated availability of sewer and/or water capacity for the relevant time periods.

Phase 1: Those areas which are planned to be served by water and/or sewer in the 1992-2000 time-frame and in which water and/or sewer capacity presently exists, or is anticipated to be provided within this Phase, to accommodate the population growth forecast.

Phase 2: Those areas which are planned for water and/or sewered growth in the 2000-2010 time-frame for water which water and/or sewer capacity is act being planned to meet the anticipated population growth.

Phase 3: Those selected areas, which were included as designated Service Districts in the adopted 1987 Comprehensive Plan, for which no active water and sewer planning is in the process at this time, and which are not necessary to meet the demands of the forecasted growth through 2010 but which uniquely lend themselves, from a land use and water/sewer planning perspective, to eventually be planned for growth.

In the Service District plans that follow, Warrenton Service District has areas in all three phases. Remington and Marshall contain only Phases 1 and 2. Bealeton contains only Phase 1. New Baltimore contains all three Phases, although significant public sewer capacity is not expected to be available until 2000. Midland, Catlett, Calverton, and Opal contain Phase 1 and Phase 3 areas, since this Plan does not project significant population growth in those Service Districts.

The County and the Water and Sanitation Authority (WSA) have undertaken studies to address the future provision of water and sewer to Service Districts. It can be anticipated that amendments will be made to Service District plans as the County moves ahead in its planning. It is a recommendation of this Plan that the County fully monitor population projections, and the Service District plans for the provision of water and sewer, and amend the Service District plans, including phasing, as appropriate. The County recognizes that in order to facilitate the cost-effective provision of water and sewer services it may be appropriate to redistribute densities within certain areas of the Service Districts. It must also be recognized that due to certain constraints, the cost-effective provision of water or sewer may not be possible which necessitates the re-designation or planning of the service districts. The County and WSA intend to work together to achieve, when appropriate and feasible, densities which will economically support the introduction of the water and sewer utility systems.

Development in Phase 2 and Phase 3 areas should be designed in such a manner as to be compatible with existing or planned utility systems so as not to hinder the efficient development of the service district or the County's ability to provide services in a cost-effective manner. It is a recommendation of this Plan that the County establish planning measures, such as zoning overlay districts, special exception approval requirements, and appropriate re-mapping within the service districts.

It is not intended, however, that the phasing provisions preclude the extension of public water and sewer to correct existing or potential health problems for existing dwellings. Similarly, this Plan does not intend to preclude the extension of public water and sewer to existing or planned governmental facilities that are near or adjacent to service districts. The provision of public water and sewer to villages and settlements is addressed in Chapter 7.

Changes to Phasing Plans

Phasing areas and timelines are based on 1990 information and population projections made shortly thereafter. Over the period of this plan there will almost certainly be a need to make adjustments to the phasing boundaries and time lines based on population growth patterns, and the recommendations of a Master Water and Sewer Plan and other studies, such as transportation studies. Changes in phasing areas and time lines, however, should not be automatic but based on deliberate decisions by the Board of Supervisors following review and recommendations from the Planning Commission.

To change an area to Phase 1 from either Phase 2 or 3, a Comprehensive Plan amendment will be required. This Plan amendment may be initiated at any time by members of the public, the Planning Commission, or the Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors may approve changes to the phasing following review and recommendation by the Planning Commission and findings by the Board of Supervisors that:

1. The patterns of population growth and development within the service district are such that additional or alternative Phase 1 areas are necessary; and

2. Public water and sewer to support the changes are available or expected to be available prior to development in the new area; and

3. Other infrastructure, including roads, are sufficient to accommodate Phase 1 development, are expected to be in place at the time of development, to be provided either by public or private funds or public private partnerships; and

4. The proposed amendment is consistent with the orderly development of the service districts.

Residential Development within the Service Districts

The population projections and growth allocations in Chapter 3 show that approximately 75% of total residential growth will occur in service districts. This is consistent with planning goal number 5 to concentrate and guide growth in and around service districts and villages. To this end, County plans and regulations should encourage growth in the service districts at proper zoning densities to ensure that services can be efficiently and economically provided.

Additions to the Service District

Additions to a service district shall require a Comprehensive Plan amendment. In considering such amendments, the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors should examine such factors as the need for additional area in the service district, the availability of water and sewer and other infrastructure such as roads, the impacts of the addition, and the consistency of the addition with the orderly development of the service district.

Determining Service District Area and Land Use

Another objective of the service district planning concept is to provide sufficient quantities of un-developed land, either zoned or with the potential for rezoning, to accommodate the population projections for the planning period. The population projections and service district allocations are discussed in Chapter 3 (Tables 3.17, 3.18, and 3.19). The service districts should also provide sufficient land for future commercial and industrial growth and for public facilities such as schools, roads, and parks.

In planning areas for residential growth, where the plan projects a population of 400 persons and if a household population of two persons per dwelling unit is established, 200 dwelling units would be required. If the desired density for an area is two dwelling units per acre (du/ac) then 100 acres of vacant land would be required to support the planned growth.

But determining the size of the service districts is not, unfortunately, quite this simple. A good future land use plan should include a mix of residential densities to provide for a variety of residential needs (e.g., single family detached, townhouses, and apartments) and for efficient delivery of services.

Equally important and somewhat more complex is the need to designate a service district in excess of at simple population/density projections would require. A certain amount of over-planning is necessary to:

1. Accommodate the fact that all land areas will not provide a net lot or density that equates to the total area of the land. A 100 acre parcel planned for 2 du/ac will usually not yield 200 lots due to development constraints such as steep slopes, floodplains, public rights-of- way and infrastructure. Fauquier County has traditionally assumed that 25% of a site's acre- age would be un-buildable due to development constraints and, therefore, has planned a minimum of 25% of the land area within each service district to support the projected population; and

2. Keep the market competitive by including more land area than needed to support projected growth. Land available for development should be less scarce and, therefore, land values should not be unduly inflated. Also, less expensive land costs might promote development of a more affordable housing stock.

There are no hard and fast rules on this "market factor" which are used to increase the amount of land planned for growth over that needed to handle projected growth; however, a factor of 1.5 seems to be a minimum and, in general, a market factor of 3 is used.

Since population is the key unit for determining planning areas, Fauquier County has used a methodology that first converts population projections to dwelling units, applies the development constraint and market factor mentioned above, and then uses the resulting number as the planned land area. The 1987 Plan contains a more detailed description of this methodology.

In a number of service districts, total land planned for residential development exceeds that required to accommodate projected population. Where this over-planning exists it is generally the result of specific factors in the service district, such as the amount of existing development. It is possible to calculate from the area planned for development theoretical yields of dwelling units. The charts for each service district show the additional dwelling unit potential for each phase. These additional dwelling unit potential and population numbers derived from it, however, illustrative only and should not be construed as population forecasts. The population forecasts are those stated in Chapter 3.

Land use mix and densities are also important elements of the service district plans. The service district plans include a range of residential densities that include low density (single family detached homes at a

density of 1-3 dwelling units per acre), medium density (typically townhouses at a density of 4-6 dwelling units per acre) and high density (garden apartments or low-rise apartments at a density range of 7-20 dwelling units per acre). There are also provisions for a Planned Residential Development (PRD) zoning district within the Fauquier County Zoning Ordinance. PRD's are mixed use developments allowing a variety of residential units and densities and some small scale commercial uses (including offices) as part of the development (the Waterfield PRD in New Baltimore, adjacent to Vint Hill, and parts of Reston, Virginia are examples). Any PRD zoning application proposal will need to be accompanied with an amendment to the comprehensive plan justifying its fit within the designated community, demonstration that it provided for its public facilities and infrastructure requirements, and meets other established standards contained both within the comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance. The Plan provides for Planned Industrial Districts (PIDs) which would allow a mix of offices, warehouses, and light industrial uses, and Planned Commercial/ Industrial Districts (PCIDs) which would allow a mix of retail uses, offices, and light industrial uses.

The Waterfield Planned Residential Development (PRD), approved in 1998, is identified on the New Baltimore Service District Plan. However, it may also be appropriate to treat PRDs (and Pills) as overlay districts that are not site specific. It is recommended that the County review and revise its Zoning Ordinance to establish PID and PCID designations.

The residential densities in this Plan utilize a higher range than the 1987 plan as shown below.

	1987 Plan	**1994 Plan**	**Density Used for Calculation Area**
Low	1-2	1-3	2
Medium	2-4	4-6	5
High	7-13	7-20	10
Planned Residential	—	3-6	4.5

This change followed a review that indicated a need for increased densities for reasons that include:

1. Promoting more efficient utilization of land.

2. Promoting more affordable housing for all housing types.

3. Supporting more efficient and cost-effective use of public utilities.

4. Providing more leeway for proffers and/or impact fees (when authorized by State enabling legislation) for public facilities.

5. Providing sufficient density to enable the implementation of a limited Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program (when authorized by State enabling legislation).

6. Providing development incentives that will be economical and at the same time foster development patterns that result in desirable communities with a sense of place and community.

In-Fill Development

In service districts where substantial development has already occurred, the increased density afforded by this Plan to properties within those districts presents unique interface concerns with respect to in-filling of undeveloped properties at higher densities than presently exist on developed properties adjacent to the developing property. In considering in-fill development within such service districts the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors should consider the following: 1) the effect of the in-fill development on adjacent properties; 2) methods in which the in-fill development may be buffered to alleviate interface problems with less dense parcels; 3) its consistence with this plan; and 4) whether such development is occurring in a consistent orderly manner such that in-fill development at higher densities than previously developed in the area occurs in a natural progression and does not leapfrog into developed areas in a manner detrimental to previously developed properties. Special consideration should be given where in-fill development occurs on parcels or assemblages of parcels, of such acreage that buffering to alleviate adverse impacts of in-fill development on adjacent already developed parcels may not be feasible.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PLAN

Implementation of the service district land use plans will require a commitment to also implement the County's Capital Improvements Program (CIP). The CIP is designed to provide the required infrastructure for development in a timely and coordinated manner, and to provide appropriate land use control mechanisms to assure that development is coordinated with the infrastructure. Chapter 9 is specifically devoted to the infrastructure needs and should serve as a general guide for capital improvement programming.

The land use plans provide significant excess capacity in order to assure market forces will continue to be operative and sufficient land will be available for development. Land use control mechanisms need to be implemented to assure that development takes place in a timely fashion with respect to infrastructure needs.

The rezoning process should be utilized to ensure timely development. Rezoning should be required for densities in excess of the lower end of the land use density ranges except when performance incentives are involved.

The County should also consider adding performance type incentives in the service districts to assist in better accomplishing the goals and objectives of the Plan. These incentives should be "by-right" incentives. Development density incentives could be granted for meeting design standards, for assisting in the provision of low and moderate income housing, or for assisting in the preservation of agricultural and forestal areas by purchase of non-common open space.

Future Measures

The land use plans shown for each service district are limited in the extent that specific details of individual communities are addressed. These land use plans are intended to be general when indicating areas where specific types of zoning are appropriate. No attempt has been made at this stage of the planning process to actually design the individual towns and communities. A master design plan should be developed for each service district that would build on and improve the community as it presently exists. Where a strong town character has been established, that character may be expanded upon and enhanced by planning future street patterns and indicating use by structure type and general architecture. In those cases where there is only a very loose town character or where no town really exists, a town center should be created. Well-planned communities help to foster towns; loose conglomerations of subdivisions do not create real communities, nor do they represent the best that the planning process can offer. Community design plans should be the result of coordinated efforts among existing residents, local officials, and a wide spectrum of professionals including architects, landscape architects, developers, and planners.

Transfer of Development Rights

Although not yet directly authorized by state enabling legislation, some non-contiguous open space can be obtained in the development process as an incentive to increase density within the planned density ranges using transferable development rights. The County, as an adjunct study, should set its priorities for desired open space both as to what types of lands (i.e., water supply sheds, prime agricultural areas, steep slopes, dominant terrain and exceptional viewsheds, areas of unique flora and fauna, and historic areas) where they are located, to where they may be transferred, and the density increase given per acre for each type.

Impact Fees

Impact fees are not yet authorized as a method for funding public facilities other than for roads. The County, however, should study the impacts of development; arrive at a methodology for measuring fiscal

impacts, and use that methodology to evaluate infrastructure and facility needs in the rezoning process so that appropriate proffers may be negotiated. Developing such a methodology will also enable the County to implement impact fees expeditiously when enabling legislation is approved, and perhaps be of utility in convincing the General Assembly to develop more comprehensive impact fee legislation.

OTHER PLANNING FACILITIES

Water and Sewer

The availability of public utilities (central water and sewer) is critical to the identification of an area as a service district. Although utilities are only one of a number of possible limitations to supporting higher density residential uses, they are the most severe. Without water and sewer, service districts can exist only as villages, with low density residential development and limited types of commercial and industrial development. The importance of water and sewer is reflected in the fact that utilities are the cornerstone of the service districts which are in turn the foundation of the Land Use Plan.

When planning for public water and sewer, the "Occoquan Policy' must be taken into consideration. The Occoquan Policy, adopted by the State Water Control Board in 1971, was enacted for the purpose of protecting water quality in the Occoquan Reservoir, a major water supply for Northern Virginia. Over one third of Fauquier's land area contributes to that watershed and thus falls under the requirements of the Policy. Six of the County service districts are either wholly or partially contained within the Occoquan water- shed. New Baltimore, Catlett, and Calverton are entirely within the watershed; Midland, Opal, and the Warrenton service districts are partly within the Occoquan watershed. The Policy limits the number of sewage treatment facilities which may discharge within the watershed. New plants must also treat effluent at the highest level that technology now permits. This tertiary treatment includes nitrogen, phosphorus, and chlorine removal before the effluent can be discharged to receiving waters. The cost of such facilities, including the required redundancy factors, can more than double the cost of treatment.

Transportation Planning

Transportation plans for each of the service districts propose new roads and indicate the improvements to existing roads necessitated by growth. Details of these plans are contained in Chapter 10. Alignments for the proposed new roads are shown as dashed lines on the various transportation plans, and are general in nature. These plans will provide the necessary framework for right-of- way acquisition, construction, and proffers in con- junction with the development process.

There are three major inter-service district arterials which must be carefully planned so that they will continue to function effectively as through- traffic movers. These are Route 29, Route 17, and Route 28. In the Catlett, Calverton, and Midland service districts a major constraint to further development is Route 28 itself Route 28’s capacity is already stressed by existing traffic loads. It is imperative that the future

location and configuration of Route 28 be planned so that, along with the development of these service districts, Route 28 will continue to function effectively as an arterial highway and at the same time complement the planned communities by providing access.

SERVICE DISTRICT PLANS

Following are plans for the nine service districts. Presented in alphabetical order, each service district plan shows the district boundaries, and key features such as roads, streams, schools, parks, and railway lines. Planned uses and densities are identified by a legend shown on each plan. The basic plans show Phase 1 (1992-2000); where other phases (Phase 2 from 2000 to 2010, and Phase 3, past 2010) exist as marked.

The 1992-2010 Plan uses property lines or other distinguishable features to delineate plan and use boundaries, as opposed to the 1987 Plan which used a more general format that often led to difficulties with interpretation of the actual boundaries.

The *Bealeton, Opal and Remington Service District Plan* is available online and the Catlett, Calverton, Midland and New Baltimore Service District Plans are available for purchase in the Department of Community Development. The plans for the Marshall Service District and the Warrenton Service District are presently being updated. Upon adoption, these two plans will replace the following text for the Marshall and Warrenton Service Districts.

MARSHALL SERVICE DISTRICT

Refer to Map 6.7, Map 6.8, Marshall Health Remediation District and Public Institutional Ancillary District.

Background

The northern third of Fauquier County has some of the County's lowest population densities due to the area's topography and the pattern of land holdings. Although several villages including The Plains, Paris, and Upperville have local significance, only Marshall functions as a service district due to the availability of public utilities. In addition, Marshall is strategically located with respect to the transportation resources of the County and is easily accessible to the region it serves. Marshall is also convenient to Warrenton and the metro area to the east. Current population is estimated to be 1,174.

Current Growth Patterns and Trends

As shown on the Marshall Service District Plan and on Tables 6.10, 6.11 and 6.12, the Marshall Service District contains slightly less than 1700 acres. The Plan provides for development in two phases. Of the total acreage zoned in the Marshall District, the majority is undeveloped, and most of this undeveloped

land is zoned for residential use. As shown in Table 6.11, Marshal Service District has a large amount of acreage planned for commercial and industrial uses.

Population Planning Needs

Chapter 3 shows a total 1990-2010 population increase of 2,653 for the Marshall Service District. The Marshall Service District share of the population planning range has been estimated at 11.2% for the 1990-2000 phase and 11.2% for the 2000-2010 phase which would require 1,822 units. As shown in Table 6.11, the total Marshall Plan provides sufficient area and density for approximately 4,000 dwelling units. Most of the area for this additional capacity is designated Phase 1, with about one third designated Phase 2. Table 6.12 shows both the population forecasts and the ser- vice district capacity combined.

Sewer and Water Status

As with the other service districts, availability of utilities can be a strong limiting factor to development. As reported in the 1994 Report of the Service District Task Force to the Fauquier County Board of Supervisors, the Marshall Service District's interim sewer solution is being addressed in a facility plan currently being prepared by O'Brien & Gere Engineers, Inc. The existing 0.32 MGD sewer treatment plant could be expanded to 1.2 MGD. At the present time, the WSA has taps available for properties with septic systems condemned by the Health Department. The ability to provide for water needs in the year 2010 is a critical issue that should be addressed. Also, it has been noted that inadequate water pressure for fire fighting is a critical safety issue. A final report of the consulting engineers will evaluate the existing collection system and include a financial analysis.

In 1987, the State Water Control Board deter- mined that the water system operated by the Town of Remington had a source capacity of .0324 MGD. This capacity was limited by a pumping capacity of 0.143 MGD and storage capacity of 0.15 MGD. Water usage in 1987 was approximately 85 gallons per day per person served. With conservation, the State Water Control Board felt consumption could be reduced to 75 gallons per person resulting in a demand of .092-.161 MGD by the end of 1997. With proper additional storage, the system in place should be able to provide for most of the projected water needs during the planning period. Using the VD H source standard of 400 gall connection/day, the needs by 1992 range between .206 and .265 MGD and between .260 and .366 by 1997.

The WSA also provides water to the service district. The area now served by the WSA may become the most heavily populated area of the Remington Service District.

Table 6.10: Marshall Service District Land Use Plan Percentage of Build Out (9/93)

	Acreage	Total Developed Acreage	Total Undeveloped Acreage	Percent Built Out
Residential	985	101	884	11%

Commercial	n/a	n/a	221	n/a
Industrial	n/a	n/a	471	n/a

Table 6.11: Marshall Service District Existing and Planned Land Use by Acre

Land Use Category	Existing/ Developed	Phase 1	Planned Phase 2	Phase 3	Additional D.U.* Potential thru Phase 1	thru Phase 2	thru Phase 3
LDR	14	217	67	0	434	134	0
MDR	32	223	297	0	1115	1485	0
HDR	55	80	0	0	800	0	0
Planned Res. Dev.	0	0	0	0	—	0	0
Comm.-NH/HC	0	133	0	0	—	—	—
Comm.-Office	n/a	49	0	0	—	—	—
Comm. SH.GR.	n/a	39	0	0	—	—	—
Industrial-Light	n/a	268	203	0	—	—	—
Totals					2349	1619	

* D.U. Potential based on mid-range density for each category

Table 6.12: Marshall Service District: Population Forecasts and Service District Capacity

	Population Forecasted	Total D.U.s Forecasted	Residential Acreage in Service District	Max D.U. Potential of Service District (3)	Total Resid. Acreage in Service District	Total D.U.s Possible (4)
1990 Existing Conditions	1,174	406	101	—	—	—
Phase I (1990-2000)	1,195	569	520	2,349	—	—
Phase II (2000-2010)	694	364	364	1,619	—	—
Phase III (Post 2010)	—	0	0	0	985	3,968

Notes:

1. Population forecasts from Chapter 3, Tables 3.18 and 3.19.
2. Forecasted population divided by 2.1 (persons/dwelling unit)
3. Maximum Dwelling Unit potential based on mid-range density for each residential category.
4. The total dwelling units possible could support a population of 8,333 should all residentially zoned land in the service district be developed. However, these figures are only to illustrate the adequacy of the land area in the service district to provide for the forecasted population and are not to be used for planning purposes.

WARRENTON SERVICE DISTRICT

Refer to Map 6.17 and Map 6.18.

Background

Warrenton is located in the approximate geo- graphical center of the County at the intersection of several major transportation arteries -Routes 15/29, 17, and 211. As the County seat, Warrenton is also the major commercial and residential center of the County.

In 1992, the County and the Town entered into the Warrenton Joint Planning Agreement. The intent of the Agreement was to establish a mutually compatible Comprehensive Plan for the Warrenton Area. In 1992, the Town of Warrenton and the County embarked on a combined effort to review the plan for the Warrenton Service District. The review of the service district was conducted by the Warrenton Joint Area Plan Committee (WJAPC) made up of public officials from the County and the Town, representatives from the Fauquier County Water and Sanitation Authority, and staff from each jurisdiction. The joint plan is to be adopted as part of the official Comprehensive Plan by both the County and the Town. The major Plan components to be considered are Land Use, Public Utilities and Facilities, Transportation, Drainage and Best Management Practices (BMP), and Implementation.

The agreement between the County and the Town also called for the establishment of a reciprocal procedure for review and comment on amendments to the Plan as well as any land development application.

Current Growth Patterns and Trends

As shown on the Warrenton Service District Plan and Tables 6.25, 6.26, and 6.27, the Warrenton Service District contains about 4,268 planned acres (excluding floodplains and infrastructure). The County, in hopes of sharing the public facilities and utilities in the Town, has planned complimentary and compatible land uses around the Town in a service district configuration. When designating land uses the County has always taken into account that the Town would provide most of the commercial and service uses needed for the immediate District and the region as a whole.

Population Planning Needs

The population allocations and projections from Chapter 3 show that 30% of the projected County growth is planned for the Warrenton Service District in the Phase 1 time period and 20% in the Phase 2 time period. The population increases (at a 2% annual growth rate) will be 3,202 in Phase 1 and 2,602 in Phase 2 to bring projected population to 15,445 in 2010 (these figures include the Town population). The additional population will require approximately 2,800 new dwelling units during the planning period. Table 6.26 shows the planned land use for the Warrenton service district. Since, for reasons discussed earlier in this chapter, it is essential that there be more land planned for development than actually needed, the Warrenton Service District is adequately planned in terms of the potential for new dwelling units needed for projected dwelling unit needs as the Service District Plan provides sufficient area and density for more than 8,600 new dwelling units. Table 6.27 shows both the population fore- casts and the service district capacity combined.

The Plan also provides additional areas for general industrial uses south of Warrenton at Route 643 and the 15/29 Bypass.

Sewer and Water Status

Sewer service to Warrenton and its environs is currently provided by the Town. The existing plant has a capacity of 2.5 MGD which is sufficient to handle planned development within the Town plus some development in Phase 1 and 2 of the Service District.

Warrenton's water system consists of two reservoirs, five wells, and two storage tanks. According to the State Water Control Board, the system's limiting factor is its source capacity. The combined capacity of safe reservoirs (2.3 MGD) and the wells (0.64 MGD) is 2.94 MGD. The other components of the system are: treatment 2.0 MGD; pumping 3.0 MGD; and storage 4.0 MGD. This capacity would be enough to serve both the Town and the surrounding service district beyond this planning period. The WSA also has water capacity in the service district which is tied into the New Baltimore system.

The locations of all the proposed land uses are controlled by the availability of sewer capacity and the location of pumping stations which serve them. Minimizing the number of pumping stations is especially important in areas of the Occoquan watershed, where the costs of such facilities are increased due to higher construction standards.

In 2000, a Health Remediation District was created just outside the Warrenton Service District. The intent of the designation was to allow public water to be extended from the Town of Warrenton to fourteen parcels located off of View Tree Drive. This District is identified as the following PINs:

6975-13-2149	6965-91-7314	6975-11-0417	6975-02-6474
6975-12-4436	6975-13-6240	6975-01-8060	6965-90-3523
6975-00-7543	6975-11-1976	6965-90-7230	
6965-90-6934	6975-00-5196	6975-01-2670	

Table 6.25: Warrenton Service District

Land Use Plan Percentage of Build Out (9/93)

	Acreage	Total Developed Acreage	Total Undeveloped Acreage	Percent Built Out
Residential	4059	1255	2804	31%
Commercial	n/a	n/a	101	n/a
Industrial	n/a	n/a	108	n/a

Table 6.26: Warrenton Service District Existing and Planned Land Use by Acre							
Land Use Category	Existing/Developed	Phase 1	Planned Phase 2	Phase 3	Additional D.U.* Potential thru Phase 1	thru Phase 2	thru Phase 3
LDR	1,255	657	90	1,468	1,314	180	2,936
MDR	0	199	275	53	995	1,375	265
HDR	0	0	65	0	0	620	0
Comm.-NH/HC	0	0	0	50	—	—	—
Commercial Office	n/a	51	0	0	—	—	—
Industrial General	n/a	0	0	108	—	—	—
Totals					2,309	2,175	3,201

* D.U. Potential based on mid-range density for each category

Table 6.27: Warrenton Service District: Population Forecasts and Service District Capacity

	Population Forecasted	Total D.U.s Forecasted	Residential Acreage in Service District	Max D.U. Potential of Service District (3)	Total Resid. Acreage in Service District	Total D.U.s Possible (4)
1990 Existing Conditions	9,640	3,336	1,225	—	—	—
Phase I (1990-2000)	3,203	1,525	856	2,309	—	—
Phase II (2000-2010)	2,603	1,240	427	2,175	—	—
Phase III (Post 2010)	—	0	1,521	4,194	2,804	8,678

Notes:

1. Population forecasts from Chapter 3, Tables 3.18 and 3.19.
2. Forecasted population divided by 2.1 (persons/dwelling unit)
3. Maximum Dwelling Unit potential based on mid-range density for each residential category.
4. The total dwelling units possible could support a population of 18,224 should all residentially zoned land in the service district be developed. However, these figures are only to illustrate the adequacy of the land area in the service district to provide for the forecasted population and are not to be used for planning purposes.